

Volume 4 Number 1-2
№ 1-2 January-June 2012

ISSN 2076-9563

Journal

*International
scientific
researches*

Журнал

*Международные
научные исследования*

The armoury of spirit (leader influence as opposed to managerial)

Armen E. Petrosyan,

PhD, Prof.; Director of Institute for Business Consulting, Tver, Russia (e-mail: moi@ins-car.ru)

Аннотация. Работы, нацеленные на проверку общеизвестных понятий и теорий, связанных с лидерством, на их конкретизацию и уточнение, равно как и сравнительные исследования, показывающие, как лидеры проявляют себя в различных условиях и обстоятельствах, доминируют в литературе. Гораздо реже встречаются свежие прозрения и широкие обобщения. Между тем, чтобы объединить отдельные концептуальные схемы и эмпирические данные в единую систему взглядов, необходимы новые идеи и эвристические подходы. Именно такая попытка упорядочить имеющийся материал и очертить контуры целостной теории лидерского влияния и предпринимается в настоящей статье. Критическому рассмотрению подвергаются основные компоненты лидерства: видение как размытый, но притягательный образ будущего; вера и внушение, образующие механизм воодушевления и очарования людей; и ключевые факторы воплощения «должного» поведения, усваиваемого последователями как преимущественно зависимыми личностями. Лидерский арсенал выявляется в сопоставлении с инструментарием менеджера, и демонстрируются их общее основание и противоположная направленность. Предлагаемая теория позволяет руководителям и государственным и общественным деятелям понять и освоить важнейшие средства влияния на людей, а в распоряжение преподавателей предоставляет более реалистическую модель эффективного лидерства.

Abstract. Studies aimed at testing well-known theories and concepts of leadership and giving them some measure of rigor and precision, as well as comparative ones showing the manifestations of leadership under different conditions and circumstances are widely represented in the literature. But it is much harder to chance upon fresh insights and broad generalizations. Meanwhile, new ideas and fruitful approaches are required to integrate separate conceptual patterns and empirical data within a single and whole framework. Just such an attempt of systematizing the available material and making the outlines of a comprehensive theory is undertaken in the present work. The main components of leadership are scrutinized: visions as vague but attractive pictures of future; belief and suggestion which constitute the mechanism of inspiring and fascinating people; and the key factors of "exemplification" and embodiment of the "right" behavior adopted by followers as predominantly dependent persons. The leader "toolkit" is exposed in comparison with the managerial; their common ground and opposite directedness are emphasized. The author's theory allows managers, executives, politicians, public figures, and statesmen to understand and master the basic instruments of influencing people as well as provides teachers with a more realistic model of effective leadership.

Ключевые слова: лидерство, видение, воодушевление, воплощение, менеджмент.

Keywords: leadership, vision, inspiration, embodiment, management.

Introduction

It is a common place that the purport of leadership consists in influencing people. And such a view is, on the whole, quite correct. Just through influence leader unites his adherents and forces them to move towards the aims intended. But what is its nature? In what way leader ties the followers with an invisible thread? How he makes them overcome all severities and hardships, loses and disappointments? What is the power urging people to squeeze, notwithstanding to thorns, their way to the "stars" promised by the leader? Unfortunately, these questions time and again remain virtually unanswered.

The leader influence is usually defined as an effect one ("marked") individual exerts upon his people constituting a group (Northouse, 2004; 3). The sense of leadership is brought by "a shared goal", and leader's own activities develop around its accomplishment (Hemphill, Coons, 1957; 7). It is also well known that such an influence takes place within a "social context" and boils down to inducing people "to follow, to be modified, and to be directed" (Galley, 1960; 74). It has an interpersonal nature and is realized "through the communication process" (Tannenbaum, Massarik, 1968; 34). The object of leader impact represents "an organized group in its efforts toward goal setting and goal achievement" (Stogdill, 1974; 57). Moreover, they extend into the internal factors of the organization mem-

bers' behavior, embracing their attitudes and "implicitly formulated goals" (Neuberger, 2002; 2). At that, the "common tasks" are carried out "within and through a structured work situation" (Wunderer, 2003; 4). The efforts of individuals are coordinated and integrated into a cooperative system (Fiedler, 1964; 153). So, it may be said that leadership implies "influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how to do it" as well as in "facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish shared objectives" (Yukl, 2006; 8). And the outcomes obtained, certainly, should be considered a harvest of joint exertion.

It seems, one may take a long breath. An explicit definition of leader influence has been constructed, and thereby, the veil of its mystery is lifted. However not all is so simple. A scrutiny of that definition inevitably gives rise to new doubts.

The point is that such a picture of leader influence queerly reminds of the meaning of management whose purport consists as well in affecting workers. How management is usually understood? Evidently, as a purposeful influence upon an object (individual, group, or organization), causing some changes in its behavior. What is the required change? Such one that conforms to goals set. And how it is to be made? Naturally, by selecting suitable people, rightly distributing the tasks among them, motivating and stimulating their activities.

But are there guarantees that all will go as conceived? Obviously, nobody can take the pledge of it. However for this case a machinery of feedback is provided for. The behavior of workers is monitored. Their successes are rewarded, errors corrected, and negligence and nonchalant punished; they are encouraged or subjected to sanctions. So develop the necessary conditions for people's striving to fulfill the objectives set, with a high output.

The snake bites its own tail. In any case, we face actually with the same circle of social rule – from setting goals to accomplishing them. Both leader and manager seek after their people to respond "rightly" and to behave in a way to secure the outcomes wanted.

Moreover, sometimes appear statements fully obscuring the nature of leadership. For instance, Katz and Kahn mean by it "any act of influence on a matter of organizational relevance" (Katz, Kahn, 1966; 334). Is it possible to distinguish, on such a basis, between leader and managerial efforts?

But the picture becomes entirely hazy at adverting to the Dessler's words that "leadership occurs when a person influences another to move forward some predetermined objective" (Dessler G., 1995; 364). That kind of influence can be exerted even by a seller trying to impose his merchandise on buyers or by an ordinary performer urging the colleagues to improve joint efforts.

Hence, there is no reason, resting barely on such a parameter as influence, to draw far-reaching conclusions regarding the distinctive features of leadership. If to limit it only to the characteristics adduced the boundary between leadership and management hardly can be established. As a result, leader influence will turn out something too subtle and mystical excluding any rational interpretation.

Meanwhile, the feeling suggests that managers and leaders influence people in diverging ways. The actions undertaken being very kindred by their direction and external shape nevertheless essentially differ from each other (Petrosyan, 2010). Not in vain, as distinct from management to which "technical characteristics" are usually ascribed, a personal component is emphasized in leadership. That's why it needs to render concrete the concept of influence in order to comprehend what is hidden behind it in the both cases. And the present article has been called for exploring the toolkit of leader influence – in contrast with what is employed by manager.

1. Vision as a vague image

The term "leader" designates a person who heads people, affects them, and initiates some movement and conducts it to a proper end. Leader as well as manager has to anticipate the future and direct people to it. Otherwise nobody would follow him – if nothing else, because it is not known where to go.

1.1. Intimate but elusive

Leader sets goals not as objectives "deduced" from the real situation and based on the specific circumstances people expect to meet. Future is mastered by him in the form of vision which is, in fact, nothing but a dream projected onto tomorrow. It originates not so much from the question "What we are in a position to do?" as from asking what is desirable to obtain. In other words, while manager proceeds, primarily, from the situation the organization and its workers are plunged into, lead-

er puts at the head his own inner intention and that of the adherents, and, passing it through the lens of the reality, tries to impart to that intention at least a semblance of feasibility.

Certainly, leader must take care of the followers to believe him. But much more important is to grasp their hopes and expectations and restate them in a form of magnetic purposes for the sake of which they would be willing to share with the leader the impending burdens and privation.

To manager, such characteristics of the goal as certainty, quantitative expressibility, and time-anchoredness are of utter significance. But leader is not bound to reckon with them. Moreover, an excessive obsession of "grounding" and "decoding" the goal unavoidably brings to that its halo grows dim, and ultimately it loses any attractiveness. So, a person who adds to his armoury thus much rigid vision hardly can carry others with him because it contains already nothing of a dream.

Unfortunately, this circumstance is not always distinctly realized. Some authors think that leader gets control over his followers' minds thanks to new ideas offered by him, and the firm, consistent position in respect of what he promises. Thus, according to Warren Bennis, "leaders manage attention through a compelling vision that brings others to place they have not been before". A person laying claim to a leader status "must be consistent, to the point that it becomes predictable, even by people who don't necessarily agree with it" (Bennis, 1990; 19, 21). But who and when became a leader on promising people something unfamiliar to them and unexplored? Which of leaders and when tried to state his positions neatly and clearly so that others, including outsiders, could foresee the next steps?

How people would be attracted by what is fully unknown to them, what is not an object of their hopes? Being an alienated aim, it could make nobody overcome difficulties. All the more so because, as Bennis states, for leaders "goals are not ends, but ideal processes by which the future can be created" (Bennis, 2009; 155). Meanwhile, such purposes turning into endless journeys to the unknown have no chance to get grounded in followers' hearts and, therefore, to have acquired some affective potential capable of stirring them up. To draw their attention a vision is to be not entirely new, but, rather, familiar and comprehensible and, at the same time, not quite clear and even a little vague - to allow people to treat it, at least partly, in their own way.

Several decades ago, Morlock displayed that the wishful future is apprehended better than any other. He concluded that "the strength of expectation of an event varies positively with desirability of the event". Under moderate levels of decision difficulty, less information is required to decide of a desirable event to occur than of an undesirable one. Thus, the amount of data used in decision-making can be affected by the value of outcomes that are independent of the decision itself (Morlock, 1967; 299 – 300). In other words, the desirability of the future states not only influences the attitude towards them but also determinate their expected probabilities. The more wishful is the event the more realistic becomes it in people's eyes and the less corroboration and confirmations are required for its prediction.

Numerous philosophers (from Plato to Hegel) were aiming to give the mankind rationalistic ideals – not only new but also logically well-founded and quite predictable. How much were their adherents

among people these great minds reckoned on? A few ones, mainly other philosophers who sought not so much for dreams as for some conceptual comprehension, had adopted their viewpoints. And only after these ideas had gotten their expression in blurry visions reflecting the emotional fits and hopes of the better future (for instance, in Christianity - through the Neoplatonism - or in Marxism) they became a base for recruiting adherents. But it happened merely because these ideas had lost their purely logical nature and the status of "reasonable" or realistic goals.

Why large masses of people followed Christian or Marxist leaders? They were drawn not by abstract ideas of justice or wise organization of society but by vivid and comprehensible images expressing their deep-rooted aspirations, and, at the same time, not binding them by the rational logic and the common sense. The Christianity promised its followers an immortality and appreciation of their righteous lives in another world. It was hard to believe this pledges but the less reasonable seemed they to people the more attractive became.

Not in vain is ascribed to Tertullian, one of the most authoritative fathers of Church, a paradoxical phrase: "Credo quia absurdum est" (I believe because it is absurdity). True, he did not tell just these words. However a much more strict thought stressing the opposition between the belief and plausibility, belongs to him. In the book named "De carne Cristi (On the flesh of Christ)", he stated: "Crucifixus est Dei filius; non pudet quia pudendum est. Et mortuus est Dei filius; prorsus credibile quia ineptum est. Et sepultus resurrexit; certum est, quia impossibile" (Tertullian, 1856; 18). This sentence may be conveyed in such a way: "Crucified is the Son of God; it isn't shameful as it is disgraceful. And the Son of God is died; it is worthy of credence because of senselessness. And buried, He resurrected; it is doubtless since impossible". It means that the incredibility not only does not exclude the adoption of the visions but also turns into a prerequisite of their assimilation, a kind of guarantee of the acceptability of the ideas to people.

As to Marxist ideology even in the second half of XX century it contrived to present the visions of the future not in the terms of specified realistic goals but, like the early Christianity, dressed them in an envelope of inconceivable images absolutely "nondigestible" to a rational mind. So, in Program of Soviet Communist party, which had been adopted in 1961 the communism was depicted as a society where "all the sources of social welfare will pour in an endless flow" and the great principle "From everyone on his abilities, to everyone on his needs" would find its realization. At that, few ones paid attention to the obvious contradictions and logical discrepancies, and even the most ridiculous expressions did not hinder people in their trusting in reality of what had been promised them.

It was told in Program that by the level of development of productive forces and by the character of labor, "country will go up to the level of town, and the manual workers, by their cultural and technical level, will go up to the level of the brain work people" (Program, 1961; 62 - 63. 65). But in what way manual work could be kept after reaching the height of brain work, and moreover, who would occupy with it under such an immense development of the technical level of production? Why country would not turn into a kind of town, and what could remain in it from the country itself? These questions remained

beyond any discussion. And that was, certainly, nonrandom.

The party leaders could not allow of hurting the peasants' hearts by proclaiming disappearance of country. It needed to unite the incompatible things. Country retaining its identity should compare well with town. But the complete elimination of manual labour could cause, in adepts of the proletarian ideology, a psycho-emotional discomfort. Of course, they would like to live and work as intellectuals alien to them, but, at the same time, preferred to keep the "cast" isolation, remaining a vanguard of working-people. That such a state was impossible - Program took little care of. It carried out an affective order. And as regards its contradictoriness and inconsistency Program found nothing dreadful in them. Rather, they became the main foundation for the broad masses' belief. People wanted it - and they had it gotten.

Thus, followers are fascinated not by something new. They prefer what is sufficient familiar and accessible but, at that, desirable. If adherents are promised what they vaguely and subliminally aspire to but unable to formulate neatly, such an offer is accepted almost without reserve. Not in vain was saying the former Prime-minister of Great Britain J. B. Law (20s of XX century): "I have to follow them. I am their leader".

1.2. Averse and reverse

Visions, so dear to and intimate with people, make them experience a recovery of their sight. It seems as if they are just beginning to get light, and a new truth, so close to their nature, is opening. But in fact, nothing more new is there in visions than in the diagnosis of a disease the patient guesses of but cannot define exactly.

Already in the middle of XX century, Oliver, on summarizing the findings concerned with the transmission of ideas from the source to the addressee, had drawn the conclusion on its effectiveness varying directly in proportion to the favourableness of the attitudes. If some vision points in the direction of a pre-existing desire it is likely to be successful. Hence, the function of the speech-holder is not to "create" a response but, rather, simply to "release" it (Oliver, 1957; 155 - 156). At that, to be accepted a vision has to manifest itself in vivid forms to arouse the imagination of people. In the same time, it must influence indirectly - not to strain too much their fancy, and to allow of keeping some freedom of manoeuvre for any of them - to conjecture, picture, and develop, at everybody's own discretion, the features that seem failing just to this very person. As to the justification of visions and their roots in the real world, its lack is compensated with the prestige and authority of the source. It serves a kind of guarantee of trustworthiness or even a criterion of truth.

The consistency and incoherence of visions the leader proffers to his adherents are nothing more than an architectural extravagancy. It by no means favours the follower's self-devotion and, rather, restrains and pushes them away by provoking an overexertion of their mind. On the other hand, the inconsistency, logical incoherence, or even absurdity does not bereave visions of appeal. And leaders never lose followers only because the promises do not correlate with each other.

They say that some decades ago in one of American university towns where the intellectual level of the population was especially high, some

surprising events were observed. Since at that time a boom of small ventures had been registered there, a sharp shortage emerged regarding premises for new business. Naturally, this question became crucial during the election campaign for the town mayor.

One of the contenders who was an unconcealed populist particularly pressed on this topic. To win the sympathy of as much as possible voters the candidate declared that he would secure the reduction of rent for lessees and its rise for lessors. Clear, none of the other contenders or observers took seriously the man who gave out so mutually exclusive pledges. He was not noticed and reckoned. But how great was their wonder when this "outcast" had triumphed just at the first voting. By contrast with discouraged politicians and analysts, the voters did ignore any inconsistency in his position although it seemed indisputable to everyone knowing what the rent was.

If that case appears to be comical and non-indicative, other, more fresh and perhaps more incredible, instances may be adduced. In the end of June, 2009, one of the Russian party leaders and deputies, during a television interview, declared that his party had drafted a bill stipulating the limitation of extra charges the trading companies could assign. He motivated the initiative by that it would bring to reducing the sale prices for buyers and, in the same time, to raising the purchasing prices for suppliers, what acquired a critical importance under the crisis circumstances. As it could be guessed from the context, the idea had been discussed at least by party leaders and among the members of its parliamentary group and had met with the full approval. Even the figures of high rank, not to mention ordinary ones, did not see any inconsistency in such a throughout discrepant proposal.

Recently, one of the candidates for President of USA, at the hustings in the middle of March, 2012, assured that he would have the gas prices cut to \$ 2,50, but undertook, with a run, an attack on Iran, despite just the pounces of this kind served the main cause of the surge of those prices, and of the apprehension of their further increase. Neither the candidate himself nor the majority of his voters have been embarrassed by the incompatibility between the pledge to reduce the level of fuel expenses and the claim to deliver a blow on a major supplier of energy resources.

It is no wonder. Human perception is characterized by a thirst to freedom and adaptation of things apprehended to personal preferences. In this sense, words implying a gap in their meaning, that is, giving an opportunity to shift it and sometimes even to turn it around, seem to people much more acceptable than those with fixed meaning which practically cannot be modified.

At the close of XIX century, W. Whitman wrote:

You must not know too much,
or be too precise, or
scientific about birds, and
trees, and flowers, and watercraft.
A certain free margin, and even
vagueness – perhaps ignorance,
credulity – helps your enjoyment
of these things (Whitman, 1963; 269).

Such gaps facilitating the "appropriation" of the meaning allows a person himself to "specify" it, to "work out" his own coceptualization, and to highlight key points dictated by his mental sets. So,

vagueness turns into a partaker of sense creation. It means, in practice, that adherents not merely obey the leader but also as though bend him to their own will. Hence, the leader not so much imposes his vision on the followers as consents to their "consolidated" opinion.

Such an inversion of of the relationship results from human nature itself. In the "Cain", Lord Byron's dramatical mystery, Lucifer at his first appearing on the stage declares that he knows "the thoughts of dust" and feels for it. Cain, spellbound, asks him to repeat: "How! You know my thoughts?" And the master of spirits calmly answers:

They are the thoughts of all

Worthy of thought: - 't is your immortal part
Which speaks within you (Byron, 1840; 216).

Thus, the riddle having bewitched Cain is provided to be solved easily. It is not necessary for Lucifer to fathom out the depth of a mortal's personality. He has also no need for reading one's thoughts since is aware of them in advance: they are just what should be thought. The master of spirits passes from the due to the existing. He guesses the meditations of human beings only because they cannot think otherwise.

In the same way, leader not so much obtrudes upon people his own values and intensions as snatches at their hopes and aspirations and convert them into a common banner. Therefore, the followers are given such a formula that, being quite hazy, is well assimilated by the supporters of very diverse viewpoints, which hardly can come to an agreement directly. That's why the politicians often express their thoughts so obscurely and ambiguously – through words tolerating highly different interpretations. No one from the world of politics likes to scare away possible adherents. And by dint of such words some baits are created allowing him to get his hooks into neutral persons or even "soft" opponents.

1.3. Without acute angles

Will people follow the leader, depends, in many respects, on how he proffers them his vision and sets out the "landmarks", on his ability to bypass the most tender and painful nuances. For instance, if the image of future stings the people's conscience, their idea of justice or encroach on what they think of themselves the leader takes the risk of meeting resistance and, in some cases, of losing the flock. And vice versa - if virtually the same ideas are put in a more presentable envelope (from the point of view of the followers) he will find, instead of hollow grumble, a full understanding, or even cause an enthusiasm.

In 1967, at the height of the war in Vietnam, two public opinion surveys had been conducted in USA. During the first of them, the respondents were asked: "Do you approve of the recent decision to extent bombing raids in North Vietnam, aimed at oil reserves and other strategic supply depots around Hanoi and Haiphong?" As to the second the question had been put a little more straightforward: "Do you belief the United States should bomb Hanoi and Haiphong?" In fact, both questions represented appeals to the population to evaluate the American leaders' vision of the near future on the one of the most important problems. But the formulations were quite. And the answers, naturally, came out opposite.

The idea of a simple destruction of the Vietnam cities had been supported only by 14 percent

of respondents. Apparently, it offended their moral feelings and, at all respect to the leaders, people preferred to reject such a decision. But their mood entirely changed when, on the one hand, the idea found some ground (by reference to that it is necessary to crush oil reserves and strategic supply depots) and, on the other hand, the pain for the local population had been slightly dulled (thrusts allegedly should be made not at the cities themselves but at technical facilities in their environs). The part of the supporters of bombing grew up, at once, several times and reached 66 percent (Bogart, 1967; 332). Meanwhile, in the structure of the action itself nothing had been "repaired". And even if to suppose that the military command was not going to bomb the local population it was well known that the real practice of war little reckoned with it and, in any case, the victims and destructions would be very large in number. Nevertheless a wily formulation of leaders' good intentions gave an opportunity to win more considerable sympathy of citizens. It might be said that this transformation of the question evoked, in fact, a "revolution" in the public opinion.

2. The mechanism of inspiration

It is not enough to communicate the vision to others. Even the most attractive will not force people to act if they do not feel concerned with it. Only when the images of future become the followers' own guidelines leader can reckon on their self-devotion and commitment to the common cause.

2.1. Common aspiration or private interest?

How the results wanted are obtained by manager? What he has to do to impel the subordinates to work in a due manner?

First of all, manager determines the functional roles of his workers, the character and direction of their activities. He establishes strict rules for interaction and coordination and creates hierarchical structures embracing complex and branchy relations between post-holders. Employees are given not only the forms of their joint functioning but also the order of subordinating the rights and duties, authority and responsibility. Thereby the organizational system gets developed. And therefore it represents virtually a single organism distinctly delimited from the environment and having a rich inner life. The parts of organization so much depend on the common arrangement and order of activity that cannot have some proper meaning beyond the organizational context.

Further, manager selects, hires, and appoints cadres to appropriate positions. Their functions are formally defined, and going out of the limits established is regarded as an abnormality that must be suppressed. The competences of workers and their duties are very diverse, interrelated, and vertically integrated. Furthermore, for the case of not all to go as intended, manager retains a right and possibility to rearrange the staff, not merely getting rid of poor workers and inviting new ones but also – and that is much more important – forwarding them on the positions where they are expected to avail the organization, and sometimes even adapting the formal duties to the specified capacity of some distinguished employees.

The final key task of manager consists in forming mechanisms of stimulating workers. Uncovering employee's motives, he tries to actualize them and proffers some means of their realization. A kind of bargain is concluded. You have wishes to be ful-

filled; I can grant you the appropriate tools. If you do what the organization needs you will receive at your disposal what is required. To tell simpler, the prospect of satisfaction of your demands depends on whether and how much you are willing to advance the interests of the organization. So the personal needs of workers get mated with its organizational objectives, and together they constitute a chain in which the staff's wants satisfaction turn out a means for attaining the organizational "landmarks".

To fulfill a personal plan, any worker needs some factors: money, social status, etc. But he can get them only when organizational goals are achieved. Meanwhile, they require the worker to undertake the appropriate actions. So, the activity aiming at the implementation of the manager's intention brings, eventually, to the realization of the worker's own wants.

Thus, to make a worker act properly manager has to interest him. But it cannot be done otherwise than by weaving into the relationship of the organization to its members, at the crosshair of the worker's personal needs and the organizational objectives, a stimulating mechanism ensuring operations to be maintained suitable in an almost automatic order. In such a case, the employee requires no permanent supervision and continual monitoring. He carries out the organizational task voluntarily because it corresponds, in the long run, to his innermost intentions.

As to leader he has no such means. He does not create hierarchical structures and regulate interrelations of his adherents. Their functional roles are not separated and subordinated. The joint activity is predominantly of "horizontal" nature and can be secured only by coordinative mechanisms. The rights and power are distributed in the flock almost uniformly and evenly. In that sense, one hardly can tell here of a full-fledged organization implying formally established connections and modes of interaction. Rather, it is a more or less free association of people united for the sake of their common aspirations and kindred understanding of what is occurring around them. But they do not obey any official order or directions.

Leader does not hire and appoint people. On the one hand, he disposes no formally defined positions; on the other hand, there is no such a need because of failing pronounced functional roles people with particular abilities, skills, and experience perform. At the most, leader can draw them near or move away. However despite the change of their moral status, it does not go beyond a "horizontal" shift.

The most obvious examples of this kind are given by the so called "leader" parties in which there is no ruling core at all. Instead, a lone figure of the leader himself towers over all the adherents. And the nearest companions-in-arm, voluntarily or not, position themselves merely as his "doubles".

Sure, as an informal organization is crystallized and takes some structural shape there emerge shoots of hierarchy. For instance, in bureaucratic parties and trade unions, bosses show up firstly in the central offices and, subsequent to them, similar "heads" appear in the various divisions (regional, sectoral, etc.). But it means only that the association gradually turns into a formal organization, and the rule itself increasingly acquires the features of administration, that is, the power is passed on from leaders to managers (especially at the lower stages).

Finally, leader does not involve his people in the activity of the association through "engaging" their private interests. On the one hand, he disposes almost no means of satisfying the numerous and diverse needs of followers and cannot proffer them immediately the wealth, social status, or other goods. Unless leader fills a position of the head in a formal or semi-formal organization his arsenal consists, mainly, of promises, not of tangible instruments of influencing the behavior of adherents. On the other hand, leader must not take into account the private interests of his followers since it is a threat for the very existence of the association as a whole. The latter is founded on emphasizing the common elements in the minds of people. And if to accentuate what divides them the united base of their activity will have been undermined and the cement fastening together so dissimilar persons scattered. That's why what is absolutely necessary to a normal manager becomes, to a leader, a quite unfit tool.

But if leader cannot make a person act by proffering him something wanted instead of the force and energy spent, what remains to do? How the machinery of his influence looks? In what way he should compel the "right" behavior from his followers?

2.2. Persuasion instead of stimulation

Leader has nothing else as to affect immediately the people's mind. To carry the adherents not in exchange for tangible goods but of their free will he must somehow attract them and call their attention to his visions. People approve of the way shown, that is, express willingness to take the "right" actions without any pressure from outside, only getting fascinated.

Such an invitation of a person to some affair is named inspiration. Literally it signifies inhalation that is a movement of air into the lungs. In this case, the part of the lungs is played by the intimate mind of the person, and the belief instilled into him comes forward as the air. The belief replaces the mechanism of stimulation used by manager in respect of his workers. Creating in followers an inner aspiration to visions proffered, leader makes them undertake the actions required and rids the association of the necessity to keep up their work through external factors.

Indeed, wherefore to spur up a person to certain behavior when it is to him the chief reward, when he finds in such a behavior a value which exceeds all what can be given him? Moreover, tangible promises, should they be made, are capable even of depriving followers of motivation - because of inevitable "landing" the sense of the work, abolishing its lofty aura. But if to awake in a person his own want to move in the "right" direction with full self-devotion and to help this desire to manifest itself as much as possible there will be no need for any additional intervention in his activity.

Thus, the task of leader consists in making what is necessary to himself and to the movement under his rule, desirable for adherents. It should become their passion. In other words, what the leader considers due must turn into the adherents' conscious dream.

But how such a state can be attained? It is hard to inspire people by rational argumentation and consistent reasoning. Rather, they should be given to experience an animation and inflow of emotional energy. At that, there is no reason to rely only upon

material or intellectual factors. What should be, then, instilled into a person as "air" capable of enlivening and raising him to do a heavy affair without securing his immediate private interests?

The single instrument of this kind is belief. Penetrating a person, it begins to induce him to actions and cause to follow the leader. The belief attaches the person to the leader and his visions much faster than interests or even shackles. And just thanks to the belief, people withstand severities and hardships on the way to the visions already become their own dreams.

At the heart of belief as the "motor" of activity is the certitude of followers in the appropriateness of the efforts undertaken. On the one hand, they find the leader's vision conforming to their own hopes and expectations. On the other hand, the coming of the desired future is considered possible and even inevitable, provided that the progress will be intensively maintained by their activity. Otherwise, the followers begin to regard the vision not as something pre-established or, all the more, imposed on them from outside but as their innermost striving. That's why they acquire a conviction of the vision to be implemented by themselves.

If to formulate briefly, the belief represents an immediate binding of the leader's vision to the followers' expectations and actions. Having assimilated the vision and added it to their own mind, adherents directly project the will of the leader onto their desires, hopes, and behavior. Therefore, any justification of the conformity of this goal to the personal demands as well as causative mechanisms securing their fulfillment by actions intended becomes superfluous. Every person sees nothing but the vision; thinks about nothing but the actions leading to it; and expects nothing but what is desirable to him.

Thus, to foster a belief in adherents is, virtually, to induce, in the depth of their minds (on the verge of subconsciousness), a chain "expectation - vision - action" without resorting to any argument, command, or coercion. The interrelation of the members of this triad is extremely straightened, refined from attendant (concomitant) circumstances. The causal concatenations give way to associative allusions and intimations.

Once arose, the belief casts aside all what complicates the structure of that connection and breaks the steadiness of thought. What is not wanted ceases to be seen by the person. Moreover, he dismisses what cannot pass through the prism of his attitude just emerged.

To make sure of the might of such an attitude it is enough to recall what a tumult had been created in 1938 by the famous radio play of invasion of Martians. The performance was so impressive that caused a true panic in the population. People threw themselves on run and offered up prayers, warned by phone the relatives and friends. Cantrill (Cantrill, 1958; 295) collected detailed data from 153 eyewitnesses 100 of which had been utterly excited and yielded to apocalyptic mood. In this state, they interpreted any information - even diametrically opposite to their expectations - in such a way that it actually only confirmed the initial attitude and, thereby, strengthened the panic.

A person, in perplexity, looks through the window - to grasp what is, in reality, happening and sees nothing unusual. "Probably", he thinks, "the events have not yet reached our area". Another one notices the street to be flooded by cars and decides that people are running on abandoning all they had.

A third having seen no cars on the street concludes that roads are destroyed and the traffic is stopped. Despite the scenes depicted strikingly differ from each other the inferences invariably turn out ressemblable and fully conform to the diverse attitudes of people.

Those deeming this story too distant and exotic may advert to a recent staging of Russian incursion into Georgia, demonstrated by the TV-channel "Imedi". In the middle of March, 2010, the Georgian population prepared to such a scenario by the state propaganda, responded to the telecast just in the same manner as Americans did in the late 30s of the past century. And the panic took place anew - despite the fact that in the beginning and in the end there appeared on the screen a warning of it to be nothing more than a play. The scare was so great to cause not only emotional shakes and nervous disorders but also damages to the physical health of people (particularly, infarctions). Not in vain several Georgian parliamentarians estimated the action as a psychological terror against the population.

There is nothing astonishing here. The human mind cannot keep its focus on the interrelation of goal and action if around and especially between them other stimuli arise. They stretch the front of consciousness and do not allow it to remain concentrated on the essential. Therethrough, the efforts get smeared on many targets, and naturally, these efforts turn out insufficient for achieving the goal. That's why mind is demanded to demonstrate a certain narrowness due to which it can retain in its focus the chain "expectation - vision - action".

Bleuler, a German psychologist who was first to study the autistic thinking has guessed that if one represents a goal more desirable than it actually is then he can reinforce his aspiration to this goal. At that, the person "must not fancy all the difficulties and their overcoming, otherwise he could not begin to act before a distinct reflection, and his energy would weaken". Such a state is akin to autism when the person is almost fully shut off from the environment, and the little part of it still held in his consciousness lines up along the attitude. "The true inspiration", Bleuler states, "is unthinkable without autism, partly as a concomitant symptom, partly as a reinforcing cause". And it concerns by no means the followers only but also the leaders themselves. "Who would like to carry masses, not merely must not to tell or think of impending hindrances, he must even not feel them" (Bleuler, 1927; 77). Thereby the leader acquires an opportunity to appeal directly, without persuading his adherents, to their emotional "tune". He gains the agreement of people by instilling them with the trust in coincidence between the vision proffered and their expectations, and in the nearness of its implementation. That's why followers remain fixed upon the leader even when that vision is opposed to their real wants and interests.

Leader is not bound to tell the truth - at least in the full. His affair is to excite the adherents, to arouse their feelings. So he obtains what manager attains through stimulating workers and securing their private interests, but compels, at that, from his followers a greater self-devotion. While leader offers no goods but promises, they fall on the loosened ground of the people's expectations. These pledges seem to them perhaps more realistic than quite concrete and tangible goods provided by manager.

2.3. Suggestion, the catalyst of belief

What is the mechanism allowing leader to have knocked at the adherents' hearts? It is rather well known and called suggestion. From the time of the abbot Faria, Puisegur, Mesmer, and other advocates of magnetic influence on personality, it is a common place that in a state of consciousness, usually named trance one can transmit to a person some ideas or induce them in his mind so that they become the dominant of behavior. But only in the end of XIX and especially in XX century, it has been distinctly comprehended that the waking suggestion - in an ordinary sleepless state, without any hypnosis, - is also possible. At that, it came to light that there is a strict correspondence between hypnotizability and imaginative suggestibility.

If a person is amenable to suggestion to a more great extent than others in the state of hypnosis then in a vigil one he also can be subjected to it much more likely (Kirsch, Braffman, 2001). It means that at the heart of waking suggestion is the same mechanism of influencing the deep "tune" of personality as in hypnotic trance - with the only difference that in latter where the so called "rapport" between the inductor and the person affected is established suggestion occurs in a pure form, without diverting factors and accessory motives while at the waking suggestion, one has not merely to get over the resistance of the vigil mind but also to cut off its numerous and diverse connections with the environment. In this sense, the leader's task is much more difficult than that of hypnotizer's.

However the waking suggestion also uses a standardized toolkit. It has been studied a few and is quite often added by politicians, public speakers, and even actors to their practical armoury. Sure, many people profit by it on a hunch, possessing the gift of suggestion by nature. But within certain limits, it can be acquired - of course, provided that suitable inclinations are present and some efforts exerted.

Among those who not merely investigated but also systematized the means and techniques of the waking suggestion was Hollingworth. He conducted a series of experiments on the audience's response and formulated some rules ensuring its attraction and instilling into people a vision and desire to act (Hollingworth, 1935; 137 - 139).

Firstly, it needs to comprehend what are the undercover wants and hopes of the audience and correlate with them the vision proffered. Persuading the people that it expresses their inner desires and expectations, one has to demonstrate that there are no contradictions in views even if they seemingly differ. The audience must be imbued with the idea that it thinks in the same way - simply its reflections have not yet gotten a distinct shape. And as regards the vision it is barely the people's own anticipation but carried to a logical completion.

Secondly, if the conclusion or the action proffered leads an individual against the group norms or sanctions one needs to "rationalize" the appeal. In other words, the person first aroused emotionally has to be given a subsequent logical justification and support. The beliefs of the audience never depend on lone testimony. They are definitely warped, even against the evidence, by desires and hopes.

To smooth the way for the acceptance of an idea it needs, first, to align it with them, reserving a rational proof or consistent reasoning for a later step. In such a situation, specious arguments are quite pertinent because the gullible easily lends to them. He confuses anecdote with proof, analogy

with evidence, correlation with causation, obscurity with profundity and uses address ad hominem, affirms consequent, and so on.

And thirdly, the rational impact on audience should occur in the direction of strengthening the opinion accepted and shifting the views of neutral persons or those who does not yet have clear ones to the majority's position. At that, it is much easier to inculcate a new viewpoint in persons who do not take a definite position than in those which have already "found" themselves. As to neutral individuals they are, in turn, more unsteady than the committed ones.

To be effective suggestion must relate to the people's usual patterns of reacting, reinforce their perception, and address the wants they consider top-priority. At that, a person is the more subjected to suggestion the less is acquainted he with the matter of ideas and the more ambiguous and ill-defined is his attitude towards it. That manifests itself especially vivid when the individual dwells in a group which encourages him to respond in a certain manner.

The successful suggestion is conducted in a positive form. One must only affirm some idea and not reject any others. Elsewise, the suggestion should not invite comparison and, thereby, to rouse thoughts that inevitably lead to appraisal and evaluation. It promises a failure because of confrontation of the idea suggested with its rivals. As soon as the critical thinking switches on, the immediate connection of the speaker with the subconsciousness of listeners is broken, and the suggestion becomes practically impossible.

To exclude such an unwanted excess and, in the same time, to create in the audience a feeling of fullness and comprehensiveness of the informational flow it is important to repeat permanently the idea suggested. But it must not be a simple repetition. It needs to vary the phrasing, what allows of representing, in relief, the unalterable core in the seemingly diversity of the communication.

By instilling belief into followers, leader achieves the main thing. He not merely "tethers" adherents to his own vision and replaces private interests by some common aspiration but also convicts them of that it is their own choice and they are capable of putting this vision into practice. Hence, the particular stimuli forcing people to overcome hardships and hindrances, exhaustion and disappointments cease to be necessary.

Leader has no need for urging somebody on. The belief penetrating the followers turns his plans into their inner "program" of activity. And to have them self-devoted it is enough to maintain and from time to time softly correct it.

3. Embodiment of the "right" behavior

Even the most inspired person having deeply instilled preferences for certain actions not necessarily attains the results required. It is not enough to strive for fulfilling some vision. It needs also to know how to advance on it, or to be able to find independently the way leading to the goal.

3.1. What instead of control?

Nobody is safeguarded against mistakes and faults. It is quite natural for humans to go on the erroneous way, being assured that it is a right direction. But when a person tries to implement a beautiful dream by unfit means the real outcome tends to be very far from the wishful one.

Manager meets such a problem as well. He sets the workers reasonable objective, defines their interests, proffers them attractive incentives, and, certainly, hopes that will have been accomplished. And people endeavour to justify his expectancies with might and main. But the result cannot be guaranteed again, for the means and modes of attaining it are outlined by manager only in a general shape. Everything else – the concrete determination of this toolkit and its application – is the affair of the workers themselves. And since they by no means are sinless and can make a hash of their deeds or overlook something in it, collapses and failures rather frequently accompany them.

How manager copes with the problem? What he undertakes to reduce the dangerous deviations from the way established?

Managers start up the control mechanism. Since the main instruments of affecting the workers are reward and punishment for the operations carried out and the results gained, it is necessary to evaluate the outcomes. Otherwise, in the heart of control are check-ups that allow of understanding whether everything is all right in the organization's activity or there is a reason to interfere in it and make some adjustments. It is a question of not only one-time measures but of monitoring trends, what gives an opportunity to forestall possible divergences before they be established and, thereby, to stave off large and systematic failures.

Moreover, realizing that not only workers are inclined to errors, manager must not limit to the performance. In the case of discrepancies between the current results of the organization and its initial intentions, the causes are to be uncovered. If poor outcomes are conditioned mainly not by the operations the performers do, a natural question arises whether the tasks are assigned rightly, or perhaps they, being primordially reasonable, have come then into conflict with the circumstances changed. In such cases, manager revises the objectives themselves and therethrough corrects the course of actions. This procedure completes the "loopback" of management, for it subjects to correction what serves itself a standard of activity (criterion of evaluation). Thanks to this "loopback", the operations of subordinates remain within the channel adjusted.

Can leader use such instruments? Evidently, he cannot. Leader possesses no unfolded and formalized system of rewards and penalties. Though, he has no need to check-up meticulously every step of the followers. That's why happen in his practice neither systematical assessments nor adjustments of their activity. Leader does not record its going out of limits and try to return it into the course established, on a regular base. The chief thing to him is that the adherents remain within the "main stream" and look, in a sense, an unofficial team, being tied together not with firm organizational threads but with the unity of aspirations and an unquestioning trust in that their actions lead them in a right way. Thereby, the association of adherents turns, in fact, into an informal organization, that is, a union of people having kindred purposes (the "vagueness" of vision allows of filling it by quite different matter) and adjusting to them their everyday life and activity.

But how such a unity of actions and results is secured? After all, like organizations keep off the detailed elaboration of goals, introduce no strict rules regulating the activity of their members, do not order the cooperation as well as hierarchize interrelations of people, and - what is even more important

– provides for no formal mechanisms of check-up, evaluation, and correction of efforts undertaken. Thus, a political party (or a trade union), unless it turns into a bureaucratic structure, contains mainly "horizontal" (coordinative) connections between its members. And only on the top of it a staff is crystallized. But when such a bureaucratization comes to its logical end, as it happens to some ruling parties (especially in totalitarian systems), they become, in essence, formal organizations supplanting the state machinery. But this means, in fact, the transformation of leaders into managers. Hence, the problem of securing the unity of actions and their outcomes passes into another plane.

3.2. Adherence as dependence

But what is to be done if leader deals with a true informal association?

To answer this question it needs, at first, to gain an understanding of what is the nature of adherents. Who are they and what urges them to follow the leader? What allows of suggesting them a trust in the vision, and the required attitude towards the actions provided for, and, thereby, of inspiring a readiness to perform great deeds?

It is known long ago that the overwhelming majority of followers are dependent people given to uncritical adoption of promises and easily suggestible. Independent individuals able to comprehend situation, to evaluate realistically its trends, and to count rationally possible choices, if appear at all among adherents, proceed, as a rule, from their own interests. That's why the relations of leaders to such followers resemble those emerging in formal organizations. And to grasp what replaces, in informal associations, the mechanism of control it needs to examine, above all, the peculiarities of dependent personalities.

Already in early 60s of the last century, O. Brim and his associates studied 200 adults and their decisions in respect of children. As it came to light, dependent people manifested much more optimism concerning outcomes of their actions. Under evaluating choices for decision making, they were less inclined to take into account possible consequences. Moreover, such people displayed also little rationality in ranking preferred actions according to appraisal made earlier (Brim, 1962; 122).

Which are the practical projections of these findings?

Dependent people are optimistic as regards the desired events conforming to their wants, for they uncritically adopt the vision and have no doubt of its feasibility. That's why such persons, unlike the independent ones, do not suppress emotional impulses and look into future from the point of view of reality but, on the contrary, strive to see, in the today's situation, only what helps to fulfill their dream. In the same time, dependent individuals are less reasonable in ranking the actions preferred because they are willing to recognize the best any step promising the coming of the future desired. In other words, the trust in events conforming to visions becomes to a dependent person a guarantor of feasibility of actions directed to implementing the vision.

Thus, dependent people are concentrated on actions. Being assured that the vision will turn into reality, provided that appropriate efforts are applied, they do not subject it to a special examination. As opposed to them, independent persons more ponder over the possible future events and scrutinize goals. That's why they are always ready to correct

the course of action to gain the best results. Such individuals are not so strongly committed to certain forms and methods of activity and do not admit blind imitation of pre-established patterns. Consequently, they call for external control.

As to dependent people they are disposed to conduct operations exactly according to "canonical" patterns. Giving them a distinct model of behavior, leader actually determines their ways of doing and sometimes even their life's trajectory.

In a poem named "The King of Sweden", Wordsworth, one of the most significant English poets of the end of XVIII and the first half of XIX centuries, wrote concerning the true leader's mission that he is a person

Who taking counsel of unbending Truth,
By one example hath to set forth for all
How they with dignity may stand; or fall
If fall they must (Wordsworth, 1914; 305).

That's why if followers are dependent and, at that, sincere they require practically no control procedures. It is enough to provide them with necessary samples of behavior and they will fulfill their tasks as well as possible.

3.3. Beyond the morality

The fact that a leader sets examples to his followers looks ambiguous and deceptive. It makes an impression that they receive from the leader patterns of high moral conduct and the leader himself constitutes an incarnation of human merits. Thus, in the Bennis' opinion, leaders exemplify the best qualities: integrity ("standards of moral and intellectual honesty"), openness ("a willingness to try new things and hear new ideas, however bizarre, a tolerance for ambiguity and change, and a rejection of any and all preconceived prejudices, biases, and stereotypes") and even magnanimity ("being noble of mind and heart; generous in forgiving; above revenge or resentment"). "They take", Bennis states, "more pride in that they do than in what they are. They learn from their mistakes and don't harp on the mistakes of others" (Bennis, 1990; 117 – 119). Whence has Bennis drawn his ideal so diverging from the day-to-day reality?

Nothing uncommon, such a viewpoint is deeply rooted in the intellectual history of West. Leaders frequently were depicted as nearly heroes coming to liberate the entire mankind. Naturally, it was very hard to envision like persons without magnanimity. And just this feature was attributed to them above all.

For instance, the same Wordsworth, in a sonnet dedicated to liberty and order, described the "blest Statesman" as such one

whose Mind's unselfish will
Leaves him at ease among grand thoughts:
whose eye
Sees that, apart from magnanimity,
Wisdom exists not... (Wordsworth, 1914; 514).

But what is venial for romantic poets of XVIII – XIX centuries seems to be rather funnily on the lips of a modern thinker. Such a picture of how leaders carry their adherents gives a quite attractive but too high-colored image of all the partakers of this process.

Leader, like any other person, not necessarily incarnates in himself the best human qualities. To convict of that it is enough to glance at the history of the mankind. Let us set aside such odious figures as Hitler, Stalin, Mussolini, Franco, Salazar which

kept, for decades of XX century, a significant part of Europe on the brink of a precipice. Even much more attractive persons being respectfully remembered by descendants are, to put it mildly, by no means so unambiguous to conform to Bennis' formula.

Can one tell about Julius Caesar that he was a frank, sincere, and magnanimous man? Only if to forget, without a trace, that the matter concerns a calculating politician which subordinated to himself, archly and coolly, firstly Rome and then a half-world. And the apostle Paul – is not he the same Saul who persecuted Christians and tried to extirpate their teaching itself? Let us recall Peter the Great which transformed Russia from the backyard of Europe into a powerful empire. What a price had been paid for it? How much people had been martyred at numerous wars or burned alive in the churches since did not like to refuse the old belief?

The point is not so much that nobody, including the most great persons, is delivered from vices, and not only that an individual, before his becoming a leader, experience a kind of natural selection people having qualities mentioned by Bennis cannot pass. Frequently, leaders have to be reserved and insincere, for otherwise they take risk to be rejected by their own adherents who do not want to hear the truth. The creative nature and readiness to apprehend new things give him no advantages and sometimes merely becomes a burden because the awkward mass he has to carry is unable to turn around the vision as easily as the leader himself does.

Thus, Lenin, the leader of the Russian revolution of 1917, who understood in early 20s of XX century that the way to socialism, intended by him leads actually into a dead end, in his last works flatly repudiated it and offered an alternative of a virtually market nature. But he remained strange even to his nearest companions-in-arms, not to mention large masses, and was doomed by them to full isolation practically excluding any opportunity to propagandize the new point of view (Petrosyan, 2009).

A quite different lot waited for the Roosevelt's military policy. American President got lucky enough to bring his intentions to completion. But it became possible only because he succeeded in deceiving the general public and manipulating with wide circles of politicians. It could be done much easier in democratic environment than under party dictatorship, though.

It is well known that Americans took hard the consequences of World War I and stayed, by 30s of XX century, in an isolationist mood. They liked to avoid any involvement in international affairs. In 1935, Congress passed the Neutrality Act that forbade the export of arms, ammunition, and war implements to belligerent nations. Moreover, two years later, an amendment to it was approved according to which American vessels were prohibited from entering war areas and citizens from traveling on belligerents' ships.

Roosevelt realized very early the danger coming from the fascist Germany. Particularly, it was clear to him that Hitler and his allies would not moderate their territorial appetites after the first acquisitions and, hence, they were to be stopped. Naturally, Roosevelt condemned the aggressors but the negative attitude of American public towards possible war did not allow him to undertake resolute steps. When, in early 1939, President asked Congress to repeal the Act constraining his freedom of action he met a refusal. And only in November, after the World War II broke out, a bill was approved that

permitted selling arms to nations able to pay for weapons in cash.

Nevertheless Roosevelt had not been sitting around, twiddling his thumbs. Of course, publicly he promised that America would not fight unless attacked. However, despite all assurances of keeping to the neutrality, he precipitated military preparations and forced the events dragging USA into war. The defense budget was drastically increased since 1939 and the national economy began converting into military one. Finally, in early 1940, President filled up his cabinet with "interventionists".

Roosevelt not merely waited for an occasion to declare war on Hitler but actively tried to provoke an incident that could provide a pretext for it. Although USA formally remained neutral he had given directions to the Navy to help British forces in attacking German vessels in the Atlantic. President's "shoot on sight" order not only strengthened this policy but extended it over the Italian ships. Besides, he circumvented the Neutrality Act and arranged to deliver destroyers to Great Britain in return for the bases in the Caribbean and Newfoundland. American troops landed in Ireland and the Navy began to safeguard the British convoys.

Admiral Stark, the chief of US naval operations, remarked in a confidential memorandum for President (September of 1941) that Hitler had every excuse to declare war on US if he would like to do it. According to British military historian Fuller, Roosevelt "left no stone unturned to provoke Hitler to declare war on the very people to whom he so ardently promised peace" (Fuller, 1987; 416). Nevertheless Hitler took great pains not to enter into clashes with Americans. He ordered his Navy commanders not to respond to provocations. As it became obvious from the captured German archives, "there is no evidence to support the President's claims that Hitler contemplated any offensive against the Western hemisphere and until America entered the war there is abundant evidence that this was the one thing he wanted to avoid" (Fuller, 1987; 629).

Does it come out that Roosevelt had not been sincere and honest with his own people and broke all the moral standards? There is no plain and unequivocal answer. What forced him to act in such a way?

An opinion expressed by Bailey, a renowned historian of diplomacy and staunch supporter of Roosevelt, immediately after the World War II, is of particular interest. "Franklin Roosevelt", he admits, "repeatedly deceived the American people during the period before Pearl Harbour". But what he was guided by? According to Bailey, President acted "like the physician who must tell the patient lies for the patient's own good". Roosevelt realized that "an overt attempt to lead the people into war would have resulted in certain failure and an almost certain ousting of Roosevelt in 1940, with a complete defeat of his ultimate aims". But how it could have happened? After all, it was just the people the President thought of. The reason is very simple: "because the masses are notoriously short-sighted and generally cannot see danger until it is at their throats, our statesmen are forced to deceive them into an awareness of their own long-run interests. This is clearly what Roosevelt had to do, and who shall say that posterity will not thank him for it?" (Bailey, 1948; 11 – 13).

As regards the magnanimity of leaders it contradicts to their purpose all the more. According to leader's mission, followers are to be considered

statistically, as a uniform mass in which it is very hard to distinguish any faces. And to attain the goal leader does not need to look into them. He has to manipulate aggregates but not individuals. Not in vain was saying Stalin that the death of one person is a tragedy while a thousand of deaths are merely statistics. Nobody may accuse leader as leader, of the absence of magnanimity. He is not bound to strive for it. Quite the contrary, just the signs of magnanimity hamper him, from time to time, in implementing his intentions.

The example set by leader is by no means of moral nature. But it is not immoral, too. Such an example must not be judged from the moral point of view. The patterns of behavior demonstrated by leader as well as the instruments applied by manager are based only on effectiveness.

Sure, it does not mean that immoral leaders are to be encouraged. To the contrary, they must be restrained and possibly stopped. But moral judgments have any sense only outside the associations headed by so leaders. Among their adherents, the samples of behavior, whatever they may be, are apprehended as standards to follow. Even if the leader is for the rest of world a repellent person (as some heads of totalitarian religious sects, for instance) his adepts unconditionally approve of his patterns of behavior and make them guidelines for their everyday life.

Thus, leader replaces the mechanism of control by some necessary "model". He embodies, in himself, the required patterns of behavior and, therethrough, specifies the standards of activity for the followers. Leader exemplifies, in his own behavior, what and how should be done. He does not reward and punish his followers if to mean by it compensation or penalties. The due course of action and its modes are contained in the conduct demonstrated by leader himself.

In that sense, the experience of so called leader associations where a single acknowledged person holds complete sway is especially indicative. Despite the abundance of background figures, they are little noticed not only by external observers but also by the members of these unions. Moreover, the "secondary" leaders themselves do not try to retain some kind of independence in the forms of official manifestation and patterns of behavior. They only imitate the chief figure and turn out, in fact, his "little copies".

This is fully confirmed by the historical experience. For instance, numerous fascist leaders of Germany, whose official positions were named accordingly – Führer or Leiter with various prefixes – even did not claim to some discrete parts and endeavoured, in their majority, only to resemble the chief Leader (Führer without any prefix). In the foreword to a booklet issued in 1937 by one of the fascist newspapers and containing the brief biographies and photos of the most prominent party leaders, it was proclaimed: "The history of our last four years is the history of a single man who the Leader is and at whose disposal stay others, far and wide in Reich, tried in the struggle, hardened in the fight for his teaching, grown in the belief in the Leader and his world view" (Das Führererkorps, 1937; 2). And all that was happening in spite of the distinctive hierarchy and increasingly bureaucratization of the Fascist party and its actual transformation into a formal organization after its usurpation of German state.

Such examples refer not only to the past. Even now, one can chance upon party leaders which, except the chief one, are little known to the general public. They understand their own role as consisting in the strengthening of approved pattern of behavior and in bringing it home to party mass.

The embodiment manifests itself not necessarily in the personal examples ("exemplifications") implying a direction resembling "Do likewise". It can also take a form of a more broad demonstration of commitment to the visions and beliefs. If the leader is fully devoted to common cause and willing to sacrifice all he has to it, such a fact attracts followers much more strongly than endless exhortations and immediately practical interests. So, the deeds of Apostle Paul who disseminated the Christianity in Roman provinces in spite of all the obstacles and vicissitudes of life, his self-devotion to the proclaimed ideals recruited not less adherents than the ideals themselves or even the heroic figure of Jesus. Not by chance, the intense and impetuous reinforcement of Christian communes happened just by the end of I century of New Era, when the activity of this charismatic leader reached its culmination.

Along with adopted visions and attitudes suggested, the embodiment ensures an increased self-devotion of followers. If their behavior deviates from the approved and implanted patterns they can be subjected to criticism and derision. It is to them a kind of punishment, whereas praise, approval, and esteem on the part of companions-in-arm and especially of the leader serve as an encouragement. And the worse penalty for adherents is their expulsion from association (e. g. the excommunication). Just the prospect of being turned out beyond the bounds of the community where the confreres still stay, not rarely stops doing actions guided by the most urgent and powerful tangible interests that hardly can be suppressed elsewhere.

Conclusion: Leadership versus management

If to summarize the results of the analysis made, and emphasize the key instruments of the leader influence they can be directly confronted with the arsenal of manager. And in order to facilitate the comprehension of their features it would be convenient to represent the comparative material in a table shape, taking as its basis the main constituents of any social rule – goals of activity, its driving forces, and feedback mechanisms. In that case, the opposition of these two modes of influencing people will look more vivid and obvious. Objectives of manager will be contrasted with leader's visions, stimulation with inspiration, and control with embodiment.

At such differences it is impossible not to admit that leader and managerial influences are not merely diverse forms of manifestation of the human nature; they are diametrically opposed to each other. However the both refer to the same scope and, therefore, cannot be mutually nonchalant. Leadership and management are nothing but opposite sides of a single process. All the differences between them keep within the framework of the social rule. That's why the problem of joining and interaction of management and leadership in systems of rule gets a particular acuity.

In this connection, another practical question arises. What is the place of leader qualities inculcation within the education of managers and their advanced training? Clear that the current list towards "leaderization" of managers is unacceptable and

	Management	Leadership
Goals	Objectives Specified, quantitatively defined, and temporally anchored goals, i. e. objectives, are used to discipline the activity of workers and to bring it into some limits, what allows manager to impart distinctiveness to the actions and create an opportunity of checking them up and correcting.	Visions The emphasis is placed on "vague" visions not so much presetting the orientation and character of followers' activity as inducing to it. These visions are, in fact, dreams by nature rather than concrete aims to be achieved.
Driving force	Stimulation People carry out certain actions because the latter correspond, ultimately, to their interests. Workers strive to attain the objectives set, for only in such a way they can satisfy their own wants. Manager has to stimulate subordinates to get them acting. They should be persuaded that there is an undoubted connection between their efforts and personal goals achievement. Otherwise the organizational objectives scarcely will be attained.	Inspiration The movement along the leader's vision is considered by followers something conforming to their hopes and aspirations. That's why there arises no demand for any additional stimuli. The followers' motives find an immediate reflection in their common vision and methods of securing it. Hence, leader doesn't have to resort to measures of coercion. Followers themselves regard the actions required, as just what they seek after.
Feedback	Control To set going the mechanism of feedback manager must use the factors of rewards and punishment. That allows him to consolidate "right" actions and to cut off "wrong" ones. But it requires testing results obtained, monitoring trends of activity, correcting them when necessary, and, sometimes, even revising the objectives. Taken together these elements constitute the system of control introduced into the organization's body.	Embodiment Since adherents are aspired to visions, seeing them as their own dominants, no external tool of spurring them up is required. They will manifest an extreme self-devotion anyway – at least the sincere ones. That's why just a demonstration of the fidelity to the visions and of some vivid examples of the proper behavior turns out the leader's chief priority. Being learnt by followers they become a framework of the activity and an inner "quasi-control" (feedback) mechanism barring deviations and keeping efforts within admissible bounds.

Fig. 1. The comparative structure of leader and managerial influences

pregnant with emasculation of their skills. It needs a quite different approach interlacing the leadership components with managerial skills. Moreover, it is necessary to define what qualities in what amount are required for various directions (production, engineering, sales, and so on) and at diverse levels of administration. That implies, in its turn, building a new model of the managerial capability and competence and their projection onto leadership. And this theory provides a strong foundation for such researches.

Besides, the outlines traced enable to systematize the available – plentiful but scrappy – findings relating to leadership itself. Such an integrated view allows managers, executives, politicians, public figures, and statesmen to comprehend and master the deep-lain mechanisms of influencing people. Moreover, it provides teachers with a more realistic model of effective leadership and, thereby, a firm basis for revising in the proper way the programs and contents of leaders education and retraining.

References

- Bailey, T. A. (1948). The man in the street. N. Y.: Macmillan.
- Bennis, W. G. (2009). On becoming a leader. N. Y.: Basic Books.
- Bennis, W. G. (1990). Why Leaders Can't Lead: The Unconscious Conspiracy Continues. San Francisco (CA): Jossey - Bass.
- Bleuler, E. (1927). Autistical thinking. Odessa: Polygraph.
- Bogart, L. (1967). No opinion, don't know, and maybe no answer // Public opinion quarterly. Vol. 31. № 3. P. 331 – 345.
- Brim, O. C., et al. (1962). Responsibility and decision processes. Stanford (CA): Stanford university press.
- Byron, Lord. 1840. The dramatical works. N. Y.: A. V. Blake.
- Cantrill, H. (1958). The invasion from Mars // Maccoby E. E., Newcomb T. M., Harley E. L. (ed.). Readings in social psychology. N. Y.: Henry Holt. P. 437 – 447.
- Das Führerkorps des dritten Reiches. (1937). Bayreuth: Gauverlag Bayerische Ostmark.
- Dessler, G. (1995). Managing organizations in era of change. Fort Worth (TX): Dryden press.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1964). A contingency model of leadership effectiveness // Berkovitz, L. (ed.). Advances in experimental social psychology. N. Y.: Academic press. P. 149 – 190.
- Fuller, J. F. C. (1987). A military history of the Western World. Vol. 3. N. Y.: Da Capo.
- Galley, H. E. (1950). Discussion, conference, and group process. N. Y.: Holt, Reinhart, and Winston.
- Hemphill, J. K., Coons, A. E. (1957). Development of the leader behavior description questionnaire // Stogdill R. M., Coons A. E. (eds.). Leader behavior: Its description and measurement, Columbus (OH): Bureau of business research. P. 6 – 38.
- Hollingworth, H. L. (1935). The psychology of audience. N. Y.: American book.
- Katz, D., Kahn, R. L. (1966). The social psychology of organizations. N. Y.: Wiley.
- Kirsch, I., Braffman, W. (2001). Imaginative suggestibility and hypnotizability // Current directions in psychological science. Vol. 10. № 2. P. 57 – 61.
- Morlock, A. (1967). The effect of outcome desirability on information required for decisions // Behavioral science. Vol. 12. № 7. P. 296 – 300.
- Neuberger, O. (2003). Führen und führen lassen: Ansätze, Ergebnisse und Kritik der Führungsforschung. 6. Aufl. Stuttgart: Schäffer – Poeschel.
- Northouse, P. G. (2004). Leadership: Theory and practice. 3d ed. L.: Sage publications.
- Oliver, R. T. (1957). The psychology of persuasive speech. N. Y.: Longmans.
- Petrosyan, A. E. (2009). Totalitarianism: The poverty of messianism // Credo New. N 1. P. 147 – 169.
- Petrosyan, A. E. (2010). Twin-born antipodes (Management and leadership as methods of organizational rule) // Verma S. (ed.). Towards the next orbit: A corporate Odyssey. New Delhi: Sage publications - Response books. P. 301 – 324.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1974). Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research. N. Y.: Free press.
- Tannenbaum, R., Massarik, R. (1968). Leadership: A frame of reference // Porter, D. E., Applewhite P. B. (eds.). Organizational behavior and management. Scranton (PA): International textbook.
- Tertullian. (1956). De carne Christi. L.: SPCL.
- The Program of the Communist party of Soviet Union. 1961. M.: Gospolitizdat.
- Whitman, W. (1963). Prose works. 1892. Vol. I. Specimen days. N. Y.: New York university press.
- Wordsworth, W. (1914). The poetical works. Ed. By Hutchinson T. L.: Oxford university press.
- Wunderer, R. (2003). Führung und Zusammenarbeit - Eine unternehmerliche Führungslehre. 5. überarb. Aufl. Neuwied: Luchterhand.